arXiv:math/0508347v1 [math.FA] 18 Aug 2005

On the Structure of the Square of a $C_0(1)$ Operator*

Ronald G. Douglas and Ciprian Foias

Dedicated to I.B. Simonenko on his seventieth birthday

0

While the model theory for contraction operators (cf. [4]) is always a useful tool, it is particularly powerful when dealing with $C_0(1)$ operators. Recall that an operator T on a Hilbert space H is a $C_0(N)$-operator ($N = 1, 2 \ldots$) if $\|T\| \leq 1$, $T^n \to 0$ and, $T^n \to 0$ (strongly) when $n \to \infty$ and $\operatorname{rank}(1 - T^*T) = N$. In particular, a $C_0(1)$ operator is unitarily equivalent to the compression of the unilateral shift operator S on the Hardy space H^2 to a subspace $H^2 \ominus mH^2$ for some inner function m in H^∞.

In this note we use the structure theory to determine when the lattices of invariant and hyperinvariant subspaces differ for the square T^2 of a $C_0(1)$ operator and the relationship of that to the reducibility of T^2. To accomplish this task we first determine very explicitly the characteristic operator function for T^2 and use the representation obtained to determine when the operator is irreducible. While every operator T in $C_0(1)$ is irreducible, it does not follow that T^2 is necessarily irreducible, that is, has no reducing subspaces. In particular, we characterize those T in $C_0(1)$ for which T^2 is irreducible but for which the lattices of invariant and hyperinvariant subspaces for T^2 are distinct.

Finally, we provide an example of an operator X on a four dimensional Hilbert space for which the two lattices are distinct but X is irreducible, and show that such an example is not possible on a three dimensional space.

This work was prompted by a question to the first author from Ken Dykema (Sect. 2, [2]) concerning hyperinvariant subspaces in von Neumann algebras. He asked whether the lattices of invariant and hyperinvariant subspaces for an irreducible matrix must coincide. He provides an

---

*2000 AMS Classification: 47A15, 47A45.

Keywords: C_0 operators, invariant subspace lattice.

example in [2] on a six-dimensional Hilbert space showing that this is not the case.

We assume that the reader is familiar with the concepts and notation in [1] and [4].

1

Let $T \in C_0(1)$ on H, $\dim H \geq 2$. WLOG we can assume

(1.1) $\quad T = P_H S|_H$, where $H = H^2 \ominus mH^2, (Sh)z = zh(z)(z \in D, h \in H^2), m \in H^\infty, m$ inner.

Define

$$\Theta(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} b(\lambda) & \lambda d(\lambda) \\ d(\lambda) & b(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} \qquad (\lambda \in D), \tag{1.2}$$

where

$$b(\lambda) = m(\sqrt{\lambda}) + m(-\sqrt{\lambda}) \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}) \quad \text{and} \tag{1.3a}$$

$$\begin{cases} d(\lambda) = \dfrac{m(\sqrt{\lambda}) - m(-\sqrt{\lambda})}{\sqrt{\lambda}} & (0 \neq \lambda \in \mathbb{D}) \\ d(0) = 2m'(0). \end{cases} \tag{1.3b}$$

Lemma 1. *The matrix function $\Theta(\cdot)$ is inner, pure and (up to a coincidence) the characteristic operator function of T^2.*

Proof. For $h \in H^2$ write

$$h(\lambda) = h_0(\lambda^2) + \lambda h_1(\lambda^2) \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}). \tag{1.4a}$$

Clearly $h_0(\cdot), h_1(\cdot)$ $(= h_0(\lambda), h_1(\lambda), \lambda \in \mathbb{D})$ belong to H^2. Define $W\colon\ H^2 \mapsto H^2 \oplus H^2$ $(= H^2(\mathbb{C}^2))$ by

$$Wh = h_0 \oplus h_1, \text{ where } h \text{ is given by (1.4a).} \tag{1.4b}$$

Then W is unitary and

$$WS^2 = (S \oplus S)W. \tag{1.5}$$

Consequently,

$$WT^2 = WP_H S^2 = P_{WH} WS^2 = P_{WH}(S \oplus S)W; \tag{1.6}$$

moreover, since $S^2mH^2 \subset mH^2$ we also have

$$(S \oplus S)WmH^2 = WS^2mH^2 \subset WmH^2$$

and therefore

$$\tag{1.7} \begin{cases} P_{WH}(S \oplus S) = P_{WH}(S \oplus S)P_{WH} = WP_HW^*(S \oplus S)P_{WH} = \\ \qquad = WP_HS^2W^*P_{WH} = WT^2P_HW^* = \\ \qquad = W|_HT^2(W|_H)^*. \end{cases}$$

These relationships show that $S \oplus S$ is an isometric lifting of $T_0 = P_{WH}(S \oplus S)|_{WH}$ and that this operator is unitarily equivalent to T^2. Moreover, since

$$\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} (S \oplus S)^n WH = H^2 \oplus H^2$$

is obvious, $S \oplus S$ is *the* minimal isometric lifting of $T = W|_HT^2(W|_H)^*$.

Further,

$$\begin{aligned} WmH^2 &= \{W(m_0(\lambda^2) + \lambda m_1(\lambda^2))(h_0(\lambda^2) + \lambda h_1(\lambda^2)) \colon\ h \in H^2\} \\ &= \{W[(m_0h_0)(\lambda^2) + \lambda^2(m_1h_1)(\lambda^2) + \\ &\qquad + \lambda(m_0h_1 + m_1h_0)(\lambda^2) \colon\ h \in H^2\} = \\ &= \{((m_0h_0)(\lambda) + \lambda(m_1h_1)(\lambda)) \oplus (m_0h_1 + m_1h_0)(\lambda) \colon\ h \in H^2\} = \\ &= \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} m_0 & \lambda m_1 \\ m_1 & m_0 \end{bmatrix} (h_0 \oplus h_1) \colon\ h \in H^2 \right\} = \begin{bmatrix} m_0 & \lambda m_1 \\ m_1 & m_0 \end{bmatrix} H^2 \oplus H^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the above computations also prove that

$$\tag{1.8} (Wm(S)W^*)(h_0 \oplus h_1) = \begin{bmatrix} m_0 & \lambda m_1 \\ m_1 & m_0 \end{bmatrix} h_0 \oplus h_1 \qquad (h_0 \oplus h_1 \in H^2 \oplus H^2).$$

Since $m(S)$ is isometric, so is $Wm(S)W^*$, that is,

$$\tag{1.9} M(\lambda) \equiv \begin{bmatrix} m_0(\lambda) & \lambda m_1(\lambda) \\ m_1(\lambda) & m_0(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} \text{ is inner.}$$

Consequently, T_0 is the compression of $S \oplus S$ to

$$\tag{1.10} WH = (H^2 \oplus H^2) \ominus M(H^2 \oplus H^2).$$

Moreover, it is clear that

$$m_0(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}b(\lambda), \quad m_1(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}d(\lambda) \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D})$$

so that the matrix $M(\cdot)$ defined by (1.9) is identical to the matrix $\Theta(\cdot)$ defined by (1.2).

Note that

$$\Theta(0) = \begin{bmatrix} m(0) & 0 \\ m'(0) & m(0) \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\Theta(0)^*\Theta(0) = \begin{bmatrix} |m(0)|^2 + |m'(0)|^2 & \overline{m'(0)}m(0) \\ \overline{m(0)}m'(0) & |m(0)|^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

If $\Theta(0)$ were not pure, then $\Theta(0)^*\Theta(0)$ would have the eigenvalue 1 and therefore the other eigenvalue must be $|m(0)|^4$. Taking traces we have

$$2|m(0)|^2 + |m'(0)|^2 = 1 + |m(0)|^4.$$

This implies that the modulus of the analytic function $\widetilde{m}(\lambda)$ defined by

$$\lambda\widetilde{m}(\lambda) = \frac{m(\lambda) - m(0)}{1 - \overline{m(0)}m(\lambda)} \qquad (\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}, \lambda \neq 0)$$

and

$$\widetilde{m}(0) = \frac{m'(0)}{1 - |m(0)|^2}$$

attains its maximum ($= 1$) at $\lambda = 0$. By virtue of the maximum principle, $\widetilde{m}(\lambda) = c =$ constant, $|c| = 1$. Thus

$$m(\lambda) \equiv c\left(\frac{\lambda + \bar{c}m(0)}{1 + \lambda c\overline{m(0)}}\right) \qquad (\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{D}})$$

and

$$2 \leq \dim H = \dim(H^2 \ominus mH^2) = 1,$$

which is a contradiction.

We conclude that $\Theta(\cdot)$ is pure and, by virtue of (1.10) (recall $\Theta(\lambda) \equiv M(\lambda)$), that $\Theta(\cdot)$ is the characteristic operator function of T_0 and hence (up to a coincidence) also the characteristic operator function of T^2. This concludes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Note that the preceding result also shows that T^2 is a $C_0(2)$ operator.

2

Our next step is to characterize in terms of $\Theta(\lambda)$ the reducibility of T^2.

Lemma 2. *The operator T^2 is reducible if and only if there exist $Q_i = Q_i^* = Q_i^2$, $Q_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ $(i = 1, 2)$ so that*

$$\Theta(\lambda)Q_2 = Q_1\Theta(\lambda) \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}) \tag{2.1}$$

and $0 \neq Q_i \neq I_{\mathbb{C}^2}$ $(i = 1, 2)$.

Proof. If Q_1, Q_2 as above exist, then (since rank $Q_1 = 1 =$ rank Q_2) there exist unitary operators in $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ so that

$$W_1\Theta(\lambda)W_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \theta_1(\lambda) & 0 \\ 0 & \theta_2(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}) \text{ for functions } \theta_1(\cdot), \theta_2(\cdot). \tag{2.2}$$

Indeed, if W_1 and W_2 are unitary operators in $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ such that

$$Q_1\mathbb{C}^2 = W_1^*(\mathbb{C} \oplus \{0\}), \quad Q_2\mathbb{C}^2 = W_2(\mathbb{C} \oplus \{0\}),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} W_1\Theta(\lambda)W_2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} W_1\Theta(\lambda)W_2 = \\ = W_1 \left\{ \Theta(\lambda)W_2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} W_2^* - W_1^* \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} W_1\Theta(\lambda) \right\} W_2 = \\ = W_1(\Theta(\lambda)Q_2 - Q_1\Theta(\lambda)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\mathbb{C} \oplus \{0\}$ (and hence also $\{0\} \oplus \mathbb{C}$) reduces $W_1\Theta(\lambda)W_2$ and consequently this operator has the form (2.2).

Clearly the θ_1, θ_2 in (2.2) are inner (and non-constant). Let

$$T_i = P_{H_i}S|_{H_i}, \text{ where } H_i = H^2 \ominus \theta_i H^2 \qquad (i = 1, 2). \tag{2.3}$$

Then the characteristic operator function of $T_1 \oplus T_2$ is the right hand side of (2.2) which coincides with $\Theta(\lambda)$. Thus T^2 and $T_1 \oplus T_2$ are unitarily equivalent.

Conversely, if T^2 is reducible then T^2 is unitarily equivalent to the direct sum $T_1' \oplus T_2'$, where $T_i' = T^2|_{H_i}$ $(i = 1, 2)$, H_1, H_2 are reducing subspaces for T^2, and $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$. Clearly each $T_i' \in C_{00}$ and since the defect indices of the T_i's sum up to 2, it follows that each $T_i' \in C_0(1)$. Thus the characteristic operator function of $T_1' \oplus T_2'$ coincides with

$$\begin{bmatrix} \theta_1(\lambda) & 0 \\ 0 & \theta_2(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{2.4}$$

where θ_i is the characteristic function of T_i' $(i = 1, 2)$. Again $\Theta(\lambda)$ is connected to (2.4) by a relation of the form (2.2), that is,

$$\Theta(\lambda) \equiv W_1^* \begin{bmatrix} \theta_1(\lambda) & 0 \\ 0 & \theta_2(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} W_2^*,$$

where W_1, W_2 are again unitary. Then

$$Q_1 = W_1^* \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} W_1, \quad Q_2 = W_2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} W_2^*$$

satisfy (2.1) □

Remark. Note that in (2.1), the orthogonal projections Q_1, Q_2 are of rank one. Such a projection Q is of the form

$$Q = f \otimes f = \begin{bmatrix} |f_1|^2 & f_1\bar{f}_2 \\ f_2\bar{f}_1 & |f_2|^2 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$f = f_1 \oplus f_2 \in \mathbb{C}^2, \quad \|f\| = 1.$$

Thus

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} q & r\bar{\theta} \\ r\theta & 1-q \end{bmatrix}, \text{ where } 0 \le q \le 1, |\theta| = 1, r = (q(1-q))^{1/2}. \tag{2.6}$$

3

In this paragraph we study the relation (2.1) using the representation (2.6) for $Q = Q_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ and the form (1.2) of $\Theta(\lambda)$. Thus we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} b(\lambda) & \lambda d(\lambda) \\ d(\lambda) & b(\lambda) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} q_2 & r_2\bar{\theta}_2 \\ r_2\theta_2 & 1-q_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} q_1 & r_1\bar{\theta}_1 \\ r_1\theta_1 & 1-q_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} b(\lambda) & \lambda d(\lambda) \\ d(\lambda) & b(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$0 \le q_1, q_2 \le 1, |\theta_1| = |\theta_2| = 1, r_i = (q_i(1-q_i))^{1/2} \quad (i = 1, 2). \tag{3.2}$$

We begin by noting that

$$|b(\lambda)|^2 + |d(\lambda)|^2 \not\equiv 0 \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}), \tag{3.3}$$

since otherwise we would have $m(\lambda) \equiv 0$. In discussing (3.1) we will consider several cases:

Case I. If $b(\lambda) \equiv 0$ $(\lambda \in \mathbb{D})$, then (3.1) becomes:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \lambda d(\lambda) r_2 \theta_2 & \lambda d(\lambda)(1-q_2) \\ d(\lambda) q_2 & d(\lambda) r_2 \bar{\theta}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} r_1 \bar{\theta}_1 d(\lambda) & \lambda q_1 d(\lambda) \\ (1-q_1) d(\lambda) & r_1 \theta_1 \lambda d(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}$$

which is possible if and only if $r_1 = 0 = r_2$ and $q_1 = 1 - q_2$. In this case T^2 is reducible.

Case II. If $d(\lambda) \equiv 0$ $(\lambda \in \mathbb{D})$, then

$$Q_2 = Q_1 = \text{ any } Q = Q^* = Q^2 \text{ with rank } Q = 1$$

and again T^2 is reducible.

Case III. If $b(\lambda) \not\equiv 0, d(\lambda) \not\equiv 0$ $(\lambda \in \mathbb{D})$, then (3.1) is equivalent to the equations

$$\begin{aligned} b(q_2 - q_1) &= d(r_1\bar{\theta}_1 - \lambda r_2 \theta_2), \quad & b(r_2\bar{\theta}_2 - r_1\bar{\theta}_1) &= \lambda d(q_1 + q_2 - 1) \\ d(q_1 + q_2 - 1) &= b(r_1\theta_1 - r_2\theta_2), & b(q_2 - q_1) &= d(r_2\bar{\theta}_2 - \lambda r_1 \theta_1), \end{aligned}$$

which in turn are equivalent to

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} r_1\theta_1 = r_2\theta_2, \quad q_2 + q_1 = 1 \\ b(\lambda)(1 - 2q_1) \equiv d(\lambda)(\bar{\theta}_1 - \lambda\theta_1) r_1 \quad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}). \end{array} \right. \tag{3.4}$$

In (3.4), $q_1 = 1/2$, if and only if $r_1 = 0$, i.e. $q_1 = 0$ or 1, a contradiction. Thus we can divide by $1 - 2q_1$ and (3.4) implies (with $\theta = \theta_1$)

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} b(\lambda) \equiv d(\lambda)(\bar{\theta} - \lambda\theta)\rho & (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}) \\ \text{for some} \quad \rho \in \mathbb{R}, \rho \neq 0. & \end{array} \right. \tag{3.5}$$

Conversely, if (3.5) holds, then setting

$$q_1 = \frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{(4\rho^2 + 1)^{1/2}} \text{ (according to whether } \rho \lesseqgtr 0),$$

and $q_2 = 1 - q_1$, $\theta_2 = \theta_1 = \theta$, we obtain (3.4).

We now summarize our discussion in terms of $m(\cdot)$ (see (1.3a), (1.3b)), instead of $b(\cdot)$ and $d(\cdot)$, obtaining the following:

Lemma 3. *The operator T^2 is reducible if and only if one of the following conditions holds:*

$$m(-\lambda) \equiv -m(\lambda) \quad (\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{D}) \qquad \textit{(Case I above);} \tag{3.6}$$

$$m(-\lambda) \equiv m(\lambda) \quad (\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{D}) \qquad \textit{(Case II above);} \tag{3.7}$$

or there exist $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$, $\rho \neq 0$ *and* $\theta \in \mathbb{C}$, $|\theta| = 1$, *such that the function*

(3.8a) $$n(\lambda) \equiv m(\lambda)(\rho\theta\lambda^2 + \lambda - \rho\bar{\theta}) \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D})$$

satisfies

(3.8b) $$n(\lambda) \equiv n(-\lambda) \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}) \qquad \textit{(Case III above).}$$

4

We shall now give a more transparent form to conditions (3.8a), (3.8b) above. To this end note that

$$\rho\theta\lambda^2 + \lambda - \rho\bar{\theta} \equiv \rho\theta(\lambda - \delta_+\bar{\theta})(\lambda - \delta_-\bar{\theta}),$$

where

(4.1) $$\delta_\pm = \frac{-1 \pm \sqrt{4\rho^2 + 1}}{2\rho}.$$

Thus (with $\mu = \bar{\theta}\delta_+$), we have

(4.2) $$\rho\theta\lambda^2 + \lambda - \rho\bar{\theta} = -\rho\delta_-(\lambda - \mu)(1 + \bar{\mu}\lambda).$$

Using this representation in(3.8a), condition (3.8b) becomes

$$m(\lambda)(\lambda - \mu)(1 + \bar{\mu}\lambda) \equiv m(-\lambda)(-\lambda - \mu)(1 - \lambda\bar{\mu}) \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}),$$

which can be written (since $0 < |\mu| < 1$) as

(4.3) $$m(\lambda)\frac{\lambda - \mu}{1 - \bar{\mu}\lambda} \equiv m(-\lambda)\frac{(-\lambda) - \mu}{1 - \bar{\mu}(-\lambda)} \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}).$$

Thus $m(-\mu) = 0$ and therefore

(4.4) $$m(\lambda) = p(\lambda)\frac{\lambda + \mu}{1 + \bar{\mu}\lambda} \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}),$$

where $p(\cdot) \in H^\infty$ is an (other) inner function. Obviously (4.3) is equivalent to

(4.5) $$p(\lambda) \equiv p(-\lambda) \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}).$$

This discussion together with Lemma 3, readily yields the following

Theorem 1. *The operator T^2 is reducible iff either*

$$m(\lambda) = m(-\lambda) \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}) \tag{4.6}$$

or there exists a $\mu \in \mathbb{D}$ such that

$$m(\lambda) \equiv p(\lambda)\frac{\lambda + \mu}{1 + \bar{\mu}\lambda} \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}), \tag{4.7}$$

where $p(\cdot) \in H^\infty$ satisfies

$$p(\lambda) \equiv p(-\lambda) \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}). \tag{4.8}$$

Remark. Case (3.6) is contained in the second alternative above when $\mu = 0$.

5

In order to study the lattices $\mathrm{Lat}\{T^2\}$ and $\mathrm{Lat}\{T^2\}'$ we first bring together the following characterization of the $C_0(N)$ operators that are multiplicity free.

Proposition 1. *Let $\widetilde{T}$ be a $C_0(N)$ operator. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

(1) *$\widetilde{T}$ is multiplicity free (that is, $\widetilde{T}$ has a cyclic vector).*

(2) $\mathrm{Lat}\{\widetilde{T}\} = \mathrm{Lat}\{\widetilde{T}\}'$.

(3) *The minors of the characteristic matrix function of order $N-1$ have no common inner divisor.*

Proof. The equivalence of (1) and (3) is contained in the equivalence of (i) and (ii) in Theorem 2 in [3]. The implication (1) implies (2) is an easy corollary of the implication (i) implies (vi) of the same theorem and is contained in Corollary 2.14 in Chapter 3 of [1]. Finally, implication (3) implies (1) proceeds from the following lemma. $\square$

Lemma 4. *Let T be an C_0 operator on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and f a maximal vector for T. Then f is cyclic for $\{T\}'$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the cyclic subspace for $\{T\}'$ generated by f and write $T \sim \left(\begin{smallmatrix} T' & X \\ 0 & T'' \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ for the decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{M}^\perp$. Since $\mathcal{M}$ is hyperinvariant for T, it follows from Corollary 2.15 in Chapter 4 of [1], that the minimal functions satisfy $m_T = m_{T'} \cdot m_{T''}$. However, f maximal for T implies that $m_{T'} = m_T$ and hence $m_{T''} = 1$. Therefore, $\mathcal{M}^\perp = (0)$ or $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{H}$ which completes the proof. $\square$

6

Our next aim is to characterize the case when the operator T^2 is multiplicity free. According to Proposition 1 that happens if and only if

$$b(\lambda), d(\lambda) \text{ and } \lambda d(\lambda)$$

have no common nontrivial inner divisor. Let $q(\lambda)$ be an inner divisor of $b(\lambda)$ and $d(\lambda)$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} &m(\sqrt{\lambda}) + m(-\sqrt{\lambda}) \equiv q(\lambda)r(\lambda) \qquad &(6.1a)\\ &m(\sqrt{\lambda}) - m(-\sqrt{\lambda}) \equiv q(\lambda)\lambda s(\lambda) \qquad &(6.1b)\end{aligned} \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D})$$

for some $r, s \in H^\infty$. It follows that

$$m(\lambda) \equiv q(\lambda^2)(r(\lambda^2) - \lambda s(\lambda^2)), \tag{6.2}$$

that is, $m(\lambda)$ has an even inner divisor.

Conversely, if $m(\cdot)$ has an inner divisor (in H^∞) $p(\cdot)$ satisfying

$$p(\lambda) \equiv p(-\lambda), \tag{6.3}$$

then $q(\lambda) = p(\sqrt{\lambda}) = p(-\sqrt{\lambda})$ is in H^∞ and inner. Thus $m(\lambda)$ can be represented as in (6.2) and clearly (6.2) implies (6.1a), (6.1b). Thus we obtained the following:

Theorem 2. *The operator T^2 is multiplicity free iff the characteristic function $m(\lambda)$ for T has no nontrivial inner divisor $p(\lambda)$ in H^∞ such that (see* (6.3)*)*

$$p(\lambda) \equiv p(-\lambda) \qquad (\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{D}).$$

7

Our main result is now a direct consequence of Theorems 1 and 2 and Proposition 1, namely

Theorem 3. *Let $T \in C_0(1)$ satisfy:*

$$m_T(\lambda) \not\equiv m_T(-\lambda) \tag{A}$$

(B) *For $m_T(\lambda_0) = 0$, $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{D}$, the function*

$$m_{T,\lambda_0}(\lambda) = m_T(\lambda) \Big/ \frac{\lambda - \lambda_0}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_0 \lambda} \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D})$$

is not even, that is,

$$m_{T,\lambda_0}(\lambda) \not\equiv m_{T,\lambda_0}(-\lambda).$$

(C) *There exists a nontrivial inner divisor* $p(\lambda)$ *(in* H^∞*) of* $m_T(\lambda)$ *such that*

$$p(\lambda) \equiv p(-\lambda).$$

Then

(D) T^2 *is irreducible, and*

(E) $\operatorname{Lat} T^2 \neq \operatorname{Lat}\{T^2\}'$.

8

Remarks

a) Let

$$m_T(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda^2 - \lambda_1}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_1 \lambda^2} \left(\frac{\lambda - \lambda_2}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_2 \lambda} \right)^2 \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}), \tag{8.1}$$

where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}$, $\lambda_2^2 \neq \lambda_1$. Then m fulfills the solutions (A), (B), (C) in Theorem 3, T^2 satisfies (D) and (E) above and hence $\dim H = 4$.

b) If $\dim H = 3$ then

$$m_T(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda - \lambda_1}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_1 \lambda} \frac{\lambda - \lambda_2}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_0 \lambda} \frac{\lambda - \lambda_3}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_3 \lambda} \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D})$$

with some $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \in \mathbb{D}$. If m_T satisfies (C) then $(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)(\lambda_3 + \lambda_1) = 0$ and $m_T(\lambda)$ has the form (upon relabelling the λ_i's)

$$m_T(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda^2 - \lambda_1^2}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_1^2 \lambda^2} \frac{\lambda - \lambda_2}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_2 \lambda} \qquad (\lambda \in \mathbb{D}). \tag{8.2}$$

Consequently m_T does not satisfy (B). Thus for Theorem 3 to hold it is necessary that $\dim H \geq 4$.

3) Let m_T be singular, that is,

$$m_T(\lambda) = \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\pi \frac{e^{it} + \lambda}{e^{it} - \lambda} d\mu(e^{it}) \right]$$

with μ a singular measure on $\partial\mathbb{D} = \{e^{it} \colon \ 0 \leq t < 2\pi\}$. Assume that there exists a Borel set $\Omega \subset \partial\mathbb{D}$ so that

$$\mu(\Omega) = \mu(\partial\mathbb{D}), \quad \mu(\{\bar{\lambda} \colon \ \lambda \in \Omega\}) = 0.$$

(e.g. $\mu = \delta_1$, the point mass at 1). Then

$$\mathrm{Lat}\{T^2\} = \mathrm{Lat}\{T^2\}' = \mathrm{Lat}\{T\}. \tag{8.3}$$

Indeed, in this case (C) above does not hold.

References

[1] Hari Bercovici, *Operator Theory and Arithmetic in H^∞*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI., 1988.

[2] Ken Dykema, Hyperinvariant subspaces for some B-circular operators, Math. Ann. (to appear).

[3] Bela Sz.-Nagy and Ciprian Foias, Opérateurs sans multiplicité, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) 30 (1969), 1–18.

[4] Bela Sz.-Nagy and Ciprian Foias, *Harmonic Analysis of Operators on Hilbert Space*, North Holland, 1970.

Department of Mathematics
Texas A&M University
rdouglas@math.tamu.edu